

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 00-1188**

---

MICHAEL H. DITTON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

and

WESLEY GEORGE DITTON, by his next friend  
Michael Henry Ditton; NATHAN MICHAEL DITTON,

Plaintiffs,

versus

S. SCOTT MORRISON; CHARLES F. MITCHELL; HOLLAND AND KNIGHT; GERALD M. CAIAZZO; ALLSTATE INSURANCE COMPANY; HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY; REED ELSEVIER, INCORPORATED, a/k/a Lexis Law Publishing; THE PROGRESSIVE CORPORATION, d/b/a Progressive Casualty Insurance Company; AMERICAN EXPRESS TRAVEL RELATED SERVICE COMPANY, INCORPORATED, d/b/a American Express Centurion Bank; CRESTAR FINANCIAL CORPORATION, d/b/a Crestar Bank; CAPITAL ONE SERVICES, INCORPORATED; FREDDIE MAC, a/k/a Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation; BANK OF AMERICA NT&SA; STEVEN K. CHRISTENSON; SHELDON P. SCHUMAN; S. ROBERT SUTTON; PAUL MCGLONE; NATHANIEL YOUNG, individually and as Director of Child Support, Division of Social Services, Commonwealth of Virginia; G.C. SERVICES CORPORATION; RICHARD D. HOLCOMB, individually and as Commissioner, Department of Motor Vehicles, Commonwealth of Virginia; BARBARA SAYERS LANIER, individually and as Director, Mandatory Continuing Legal Education Board, Virginia State Bar; ALEXANDRIA COUNTRY CLUB APARTMENTS, d/b/a Oakwood Apartments Alexandria; R&B REALTY GROUP;

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE; DEPARTMENT OF  
THE ARMY; JOE DOE; S. SCOTT MORRISON CHAR-  
TERED; CAPITAL ONE FINANCIAL CORPORATION,  
d/b/a Capital One Bank,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Albert V. Bryan, Jr., Senior  
District Judge. (CA-99-1901-A)

---

Submitted: October 31, 2000

Decided: November 28, 2000

---

Before LUTTIG, WILLIAMS, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Michael Henry Ditton, Appellant Pro Se. John Patrick Rowley, III,  
HOLLAND & KNIGHT, L.L.P., Falls Church, Virginia; Christopher  
Daniel Williams, BRANDT, JENNINGS, ROBERTS, DAVIS & SNEE, Falls  
Church, Virginia; Michael Joseph McManus, DRINKER, BIDDLE & REATH,  
L.L.P., Washington, D.C.; Ronda Lynn Brown, MCGUIRE, WOODS, L.L.P.,  
McLean, Virginia; Neil Joseph MacDonald, HARTEL, KANE, DESANTIS,  
MACDONALD & HOWIE, L.L.P., Greenbelt, Maryland; Stephen Murray  
Seeger, QUAGLIANO & SEEGER, Washington, D.C.; C. Thomas Brown,  
SILVER & BROWN, Fairfax, Virginia; James A. Murphy, Jr., Harris Lee  
Kay, LECLAIR RYAN, P.C., Richmond, Virginia; Cindra Myers Dowd,  
GLASSER & GLASSER, Norfolk, Virginia; Brian M. McCormick, OFFICE OF  
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia; J. Thomas  
Fromme, II, SHERMAN & FROMME, Fairfax, Virginia, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.  
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Michael H. Ditton appeals the district court's orders denying his requests for temporary restraining orders. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Ditton v. Morrison, No. CA-99-1901-A (E.D. Va. Jan. 18, 2000; Feb. 4, 2000). Ditton's motion to expedite his appeal is denied as moot. Ditton's motions to compel filing of corporate disclosure statements and to strike other disclosure statements are denied. Ditton's multiple motions to show cause and for either sanctions or attorney disqualification against various Appellees are denied. Ditton's motion to consolidate is denied. Ditton's motion to strike Appellee Crestar's response to the motion to consolidate is denied. Appellees Freddie Mac and Bank of America's joint motion to compel service of motions filed is denied. Appellees S. Scott Morrison, Charles Mitchell, and Holland and Knight's motion for summary disposition is denied as moot. In light of the disposition of the appeal, we decline to reconsider the order denying Ditton's prior request for a stay of this appeal. Ditton's second motion for relief under Fed. R. App. P. 8 is denied and we deny leave to exceed this court's page limitations in motion pleading. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and

legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED